



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/425,436	10/22/1999	RICHARD ROBERT CAPPADONA	66635	9564

22242 7590 03/06/2002

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY  
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET  
SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

BECKER, DREW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

3

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/425,436

Applicant(s)

CAPPADONA ET AL.

Examiner

Drew E Becker

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6 and 8-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6 and 8-19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer [Pat. No. 4,330,069] in view of Stephen et al [Pat. No. 4,966,125].  
Bauer teaches a cooking device comprising a cooking vessel (column 5, line 58), a lid with a curved shape and rim (Figure 3, 1"), a knob assembly which acts as a holder (Figure 3, 2"), an aperture which passes through the lid and knob assembly and contains a thermometer (Figure 3, 24), a temperature display (Figure 4, 23), a temperature sensor above the level of the rim (Figure 3, 22), and a retaining member (Figure 3, 3"a). Bauer does not teach removing the thermometer or the probe having a hollow tubular structure. Stephen et al teach a cooking device having a removable thermometer located in the handle of a lid (Figure 3, 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the removable thermometer of Stephen et al into the invention of Bauer since both are directed to cooking devices with thermometers in their handles, since the thermometer of Bauer lacks any impediments to its being lifted out of the lid handle (Figure 3), and since Stephen et al teach that a removable thermometer can be used to measure the temperature of the food itself as well as the air temperature within the vessel (column 4, lines 11-16). Although not

Art Unit: 1761

specifically recited, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the temperature probe of Bauer would be hollow since thermometers were commonly made with hollow tubular bodies in order to hold a temperature sensitive material such as mercury, a spring, or a thermocouple. Phrases such as "for use in stove top waterless cooking" are merely preferred methods of using the claimed apparatus and as such are not given patentable weight.

1. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hupf et al [Pat. No. 6,004,000] in view of Bauer.

Hupf et al teach a method of waterless cooking by placing food with little or no water into a pan, placing a lid over the pan, heating the bottom of the pan, measuring the temperature, closing the vent, and reducing the heat (column 6, lines 31-44), the lid comprising a knob (Figure 2A, 100), a vent (Figure 2A, 25), and a temperature sensor (Figure 1, 150). Hupf et al do not teach a thermometer which extends through the lid. Bauer teaches a lid with a thermometer which extends through the lid (Figure 3, 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the thermometer of Bauer into the invention of Hupf et al since both are directed to methods of cooking, since Hupf et al already includes a temperature sensor, and since the thermometer of Bauer would provide a more accurate and quicker temperature reading since it directly senses the temperature of the atmosphere within the pot, rather than the temperature of the lid which is in turn heated by the air within the pot, as done by Hupf et al.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 2-6 and 8-19 are allowed.
4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the cooking devices of independent claims 2, 8, and 15 define over the prior art of record since the prior art does not teach, suggest, nor render obvious a dual function notch which enables removal of the movable member and acts as a slot to enable the whistle.
5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Barbour [Pat. No. 6,293,271] teaches a cooking device comprising a lid with a thermometer and vent.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed February 8, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Stephen et al is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Bauer and Stephen et al are directed to cooking devices with thermometers mounted in the lid.

Applicant contends that "the Bauer reference is merely a "paper patent", and does not describe an operative device." Applicants are reminded that, regardless of their personal opinion of the Bauer reference, it still teaches the claimed device and cannot be overcome by simply dismissing it as being inoperable or not being a "commercial product". The issue is not Mr. Bauer's skill in marketing his invention, but rather what the reference discloses.

The declaration of Mr. Cappadona has been entered, but does not overcome the rejections of record for the above reasons.

### ***Conclusion***

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1761

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 703-305-0300. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 703-308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3602 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1495.

Drew Becker  
February 27, 2002

  
**KEITH HENDRICKS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**